

## Dabbs, Paul

---

**From:** Arnold Whitridge [awhitridge@snowcrest.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2002 11:09 AM  
**To:** dceppos@saclink.csus.edu; Dabbs, Paul  
**Subject:** more portfolio comment

I was looking forward to some clarifying discussion about the regional portfolios at the December 13 AC meeting, but since this didn't happen, another comment here:

In the case of the North Coast, it seems that flows of wild and scenic rivers are included in the draft "Developed Water Supply- Water Use Balances". This is confusing at best, because wild and scenic flows are by legal requirement and by practical definition "undeveloped". Even if the legal requirement did not exist, there is little or no current capacity to capture, control, or divert wild and scenic flows, so it seems incorrect to include them in an accounting of developed supplies and uses. I agree that any minimum flows required past dams or diversions (as in the case of the Trinity River, which is wild and scenic below the dams) are indeed uses of a developed supply and should appear in the balances, but I can't imagine a justification for lumping such minimums together with uncontrollable tributary flows entering downstream from the dams, and with flows in undammed systems, and calling the result a supply or use of developed water.

I support the inclusion of accurate "Developed Water Supply- Water Use Balances" in B-160. It seems to me that accurate balances must include all uses of developed water (including Regional Transfers Out, as I tried to say in my December 12 message), and no use of undeveloped water. I'm hoping I can get a DWR response to these comments prior to the next AC meeting, to help my thinking and inform my discussions with colleagues. Thanks,

Arnold Whitridge